HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVII, No. 14 Thursday, April 7, 1960 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

GOLDWATER: *Carolina stirs the GOP* ..... (page 1)

KENNEDY: *Campaign spending mounts* ..... (page 2)

ROCKY: *His "back room" bank bill* ..... (page 3)

CHURCH COUNCIL: *Red smut for kiddies* (page 4)

CUBA: *Braden's realistic view* ..... (page 4)

The Goldwater Phenomenon: In a surprise move, the Republican party of South Carolina has pledged its convention delegates to Senator Barry Goldwater, instead of to Nixon, and thereby has stirred up great interest among political reporters and dopesters in the Capital.

Not that South Carolina's 13 delegates loom large in the GOP spectrum, nor that the great enthusiasm manifested at the southern meeting for Goldwater is surprising, since the Palmetto State is very conservative. But everyone agrees that something of great potential importance has occurred.

Political observers continue to discuss the event, in the light of the Arizona Senator's exciting remarks afterward and in the context of another matter—the phenomenon of Nixon's disturbing sag in popularity. And they scan the horizon for other surprises to appear in northern and western states.

Even if such do materialize, no political reporters expect that they will impede the predestined nomination of Nixon at the GOP convention next August. But observers do speculate keenly on whether, thereby, the party's candidate will be swayed by the Goldwater phenomenon.

In an interview a few days after the South Carolina affair, Goldwater very bluntly expressed his dismay about Nixon's "swing to the left," which explained the steam behind the southern state party's action. Conservative Republicans generally, he warned, are "restless." Most Republican party workers and leaders, as well as independent voters, "don't want us to put up another 'me-too' candidate like Willkie or Dewey this year."

The Arizonan revealed that he had warned both Nixon and GOP Chairman Morton of this critical reaction in the party. "If party groups in a few other states do something like they did in South Carolina," he remarked, "Messrs. Nixon and Morton may have to sit up and take notice."

Apparently, Nixon did take notice, for three days later, in addressing a GOP meeting in Lincoln, Neb., he made no attempt to project the fatal "liberal image" before the eyes of this farm state audience.

Does Goldwater still back Nixon for the nomination? The Senator emphasizes that he has supported Nixon for the Presidential nomination for the past five years and expects to be "out working for him" in the fall campaign. Goldwater apparently welcomes developments such as those in South Carolina as healthy steam valves to vent the sentiments of the GOP conservatives in this period of "no contest" for the nomination. Party morale has become flabby and Nixon's stock has suffered. To remedy this, say observers, it remains for him to "cut a conservative image."

The press has generally failed either to mention or to comment on the South Carolina action in favor of Goldwater for President. This press attitude confirms charges that HUMAN EVENTS has made. Last week, in an article "Enemy Columnists Hope to 'Help' GOP," James L. Wick, Executive Publisher of HUMAN EVENTS, ironically described how for many years "liberal" commentators and editorialists have sought to persuade Republican candidates that, to win, the latter should turn "liberal."

Today, they write similarly in respect to Nixon. This sort of performance (if Nixon continues to fall for it) might well—as in the case of Dewey and Willkie—result in a Democratic victory next fall. Such an outcome, of course, is just what the "liberal" men in the press seek to bring about.

No surprise, therefore, that these left-wing scribes have almost totally ignored the news from South Carolina, which by any standard should rate as news. Obviously, they give it "the silent treatment" for they fear Nixon may heed the portent. And they continue their game of polishing a "liberal image" of Nixon, so as to defeat him next November. As one observer put it this week, "The same old poisoned breakfast food is on the table every morning in the editorial pages of the paper."

Camp David: From the political and diplomatic standpoint, the Eisenhower-Macmillan agreement on nuclear testing, reached at the President's famous Camp David last week, was an appeasement move, sought by Macmillan and accepted by the Anglophile Secretary of State Herter. The British want it as a concession to Moscow, chiefly as a step in forging an Anglo-Russian front to break up the Franco-German front. As usual, the primary British interest is in foreign trade and an Anglo-Russian diplomatic front might serve as a wedge to undermine the Common Market, which rests on the two main pillars of France and Germany.

GOP Vice Presidency: One of the curiosities of press talk about Nixon's possible running mate in the coming election campaign is the consideration given to the name of Ambassador (to the UN) Henry Cabot Lodge.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Few in the Capital believe Nixon wants Lodge, nor that the Nixon entourage have discussed him seriously as a candidate.

As for the politicos, they laugh at the suggestion to make Lodge the Vice Presidential candidate in the coming hot campaign, for at least one reason. Lodge established an unparalleled record of failure at the polls.

He was one of the few Republicans in 1952 (when he ran for Senatorial re-election in Massachusetts) who went down to ignominious defeat at the same time the Republican ticket and Eisenhower were winning a big victory. Lodge was steam-rollered by John F. Kennedy, who may be the Democratic candidate for President next fall. The Lodge name has the connotation of defeat.

Additionally, Lodge was long known as an adversary of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. After the November victory in 1952, Lodge reportedly sought to block the selection of the latter as Secretary of State. Later, he was considered to be one of the "soft-on-communism" set, as a frequent visitor to the White House when Sherman Adams held sway. Dulles reportedly had to reckon with Lodge (who held cabinet rank) in his efforts to fight appeasement policies within the Administration. Since Nixon, during those years, was a friend and ally of anti-appeaser Dulles, it seems unlikely he would want Lodge as a running-mate.

World Court: The "liberal" drive to repeal the Connally Reservation keeping US domestic affairs free from World Court interference has been blocked—due to the barrage of letters from conservatives throughout the Nation protesting the repeal move.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week bowed to the popular will and voted, 9 to 7, on the motion of statesmanlike Senator Bourke Hickenlooper (R.-Iowa), to pigeonhole Senator Hubert Humphrey's repealer bill, presumably killing it for the rest of the session, according to Chairman J. William Fulbright (D.-Ark.).

The victory, achieved over the opposition of both the Administration and leading Democrats in Congress, demonstrates again what many on Capitol Hill have often said: when the grass roots makes itself heard in plain language, the Congress listens and obeys. A survey of Congressmen's mail revealed that the solons have received more letters and cards protesting the World Court repeal than on any other topic this session.

Part of the credit for halting the drive, at least until next year, must also go to those who led former Senator Tom Connally of Texas, author of the Reservation, to return from the obscurity of retirement and urge the Senate in forceful terms to vote against repeal. Connally's dramatic statement, coupled with the letters from patriotic groups and individuals, are regarded here as the chief instruments in halting the "liberals."

Kennedy: With Nelson Rockefeller's exit from the nomination race, Republicans were relieved of the possibility of shouldering the burden of a "rich man's candidate," a "man who bought the nomination." But many Democrats grow increasingly uneasy, realizing they may find themselves with such a nominee in "Plenty of Jack" Kennedy.

Reports from Wisconsin are that even the Humphrey estimate of Kennedy spending a half million dollars on the primary is low. Observers on the scene with many years' experience in such contests recall nothing to equal the Bostonian's campaign. *Newsweek* referred to it as a "high powered and smoothly functioning operation."

Where most Kennedy money apparently goes is not for billboards and pamphlets, but the functions of the highly mobile and professional Kennedy staff of experts. Many liken the Kennedy team in Wisconsin to the Rockefeller "brain trust" active until recently in New York City. Kennedy has in his pay "image creators," opinion specialists, political analysts, and farm and labor experts ready to prep Jack on all aspects of these key issues.

But with Kennedy spending up a storm, political veterans call attention to the maxim that "it's all right to toss around the green stuff when trying to get elected as long as you don't draw too much attention in the process."

Capitol Hill railbirds recall that unusually high-powered Presidential nomination campaigns in 1920 by Governor Lowden of Illinois and General Leonard Wood stirred adverse public reaction. The GOP convention that year passed over these two and nominated a dark horse, Warren G. Harding.

One pointed joke making the Capitol Hill rounds is that "Joe Kennedy made his son Jack a present of a million dollars on his 21st birthday [the elder Kennedy gave each offspring a like amount of his $250 million fortune upon their coming of age] and is doing all he can to purchase the Presidency for his boy at 42."

Candidates: How much of a "moderate" does the latest declared Democratic candidate, Senator Stu Symington, consider himself? HUMAN EVENTS attempted to find out at the Missourian's March 24 press conference announcing his candidacy.

Asked our reporter: "Senator, many observers think you will appeal to the Democratic convention and the nation as a moderate. The ADA's listing of 13 key issues for 1959 has you voting 'right' with the ADA all 13 times. Do you feel you can appeal as a 'moderate' in view of this record?" (ADA is a socialistic political action group.)

Replied Symington: "I don't know whether I qualify as a moderate or an immoderate. I hope everyone in ADA and all these other organizations votes for me."

● Reports from the Senate press gallery have it that the boys aren't taking a rosy view of Lyndon Johnson's complicated floor maneuvers to gain personal ends. Chicago *Tribune* bureau chief Walter Trohan reports the current cloakroom description of Lyndon: "A man who has proved, beyond question, that the shortest distance between two points is not a straight line."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

● In Michigan, four-term Representative Alvin Bentley has announced for the Republican nomination to oppose incumbent Senator Pat McNamara, often termed "the Senator from the UAW." Bentley, a vigorous anti-Communist and champion of the captive nations, may be opposed in the primary, but is considered a capable candidate who should do well against McNamara. An indication that the Democrats fear Bentley came as soon as he announced his candidacy: Democratic Chairman Paul Butler immediately demanded that Bentley explain a loan of $10,000 to the late Senator Joe McCarthy to aid McCarthy's fight against communism.

Budget: First thing the Senate did when it temporarily set aside civil rights last week was to pass a "supplemental" appropriations bill for the current fiscal year, calling for $979 million—a hike of $742 million from the bill approved by the House. "It would have been much cheaper," ran one Senatorial comment, "if we hadn't recessed the filibuster."

Supplemental appropriations are a time-honored bureaucratic device for getting around Budget-cutters in Congress; when the legislators respond to grass roots appeals to cut back on the empire-builders in the Executive Branch, the bureaucrats frequently continue to spend money at the same rate—and then go back to Congress when the money runs out, and the public pressure is off. Generally, the extra money must be given because it is for purposes already authorized by Congress.

The supplemental appropriation passed by the Senate last week—if the House goes along with the increases—will wipe out over half of the $1.8 billion surplus achieved by the people in the "Sound Dollar" economy drive last year. Most of the money—$675 million—will go to pay for more storage facilities for the farm surpluses being piled up as a result of the Democratic farm program.

Youth Conference: While President Eisenhower huddled with Britain's Macmillan getting ready for the Summit, Washington wondered whether he was aware of goings-on at the White House Conference on Children and Youth he sponsors.

Not a few among the welfare workers and "child experts" attending the meetings last week impressed Capital veterans as the most radical crew of characters to invade Washington since the 1930's. (The Federal Government has put up $350,000 for this show.) Observers at the sessions reported that United Nations jargon was used at all times. A "bill of rights for children" and international youth camps to "condition" problem kids, patterned after UNESCO projects, were championed with wide response.

Unreported in the press were speakers' remarks such as "If we are to socialize the child we must release him earlier and earlier from the nuclear family [father and mother] to the larger family [the State]."

The assembled doubledomes agreed that the "prototype family"—one with a mother and father married to each other—is no longer the normal family, because of the high modern incidence of divorce and illegitimacy.

Dr. Milton J. E. Senn of the Yale University Child Study Center questioned the wisdom of having successful businessmen teach Sunday school. He stated this group often tells children that "they are promised success if they follow certain ritualistic practices such as attending church regularly, praying before a business deal and calling on God to give them insight enough to outsmart the other fellow."

A New York woman social worker scored TV as hurting racial relations among children because westerns "always show the Indian getting killed and the white man the hero."

The biggest fraud swallowed by the papers was the assumption that the "conference" was a free, open and unmanaged forum for a group of "just folks" from the grass roots.

Through all the saccharine talk in the conference, a few conservatives who managed to attend as delegates reported the sessions were run on anything but an open basis, with dissenters continually reminded that affairs were being conducted in a "thought in motion" spirit. The "liberal"-internationalists (who are obviously running the show) made it clear that dissenting opinions were not to be encouraged, and that pre-arranged objectives could only be achieved by a steady "flow of thought"—the process "liberals" refer to as "group dynamics."

Rockefeller: Nelson Rockefeller's posture as a selfless benevolent billionaire received a nudge last week as political sources attempted to piece together Rocky's role in the passage of a banking bill beneficial to the Chase Manhattan Bank, of which brother David Rockefeller is board chairman.

The bill, introduced by State Senator John H. Cooke (R.-Erie), was passed by the New York State Legislature to replace a bill renewed every year for the past six years which prevented New York City banks from operating outside city limits. It will allow the Chase and other city banks to operate in Westchester and Nassau Counties, which are just outside the big town and which have enjoyed a large business and investment upturn in recent years. Many bankers in these suburbs claim the bill makes them the victims of a financial invasion by city banking interests.

But while financial circles argued the merits of the bill, political circles were more interested in events leading up to passage. The legislation was passed at a "midnight oil" session Monday, March 21. Yet on the previous Friday passage was deemed out of the question.

At that time the Democrats and many Republicans strongly opposed the bill. Albany hands report that sufficient votes were obtained only after friends of the Governor talked to the Democrats in a weekend caucus. In what one State Senator called a "lightning switch" the Democrats came around from their stubborn opposition when the bill came up Monday, to the amazement of the legislative press room.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One highly regarded New York financial columnist told HUMAN EVENTS: "There's something very funny about the switch on this bill, and not even our political reporters have been able to get to the bottom of it. The best bet on this thing seems to be that the Governor's camp gave the Democrats some kind of payoff."

Although Nelson has sold his bank stock to avoid any conflict-of-interest charges, this financial maneuver on the banks of the Hudson creates a new profile of the Governor—from a "gee whiz" political tyro to a shrewd backroom manipulator.

National Council of Churches: With the echoes of the tumult about the Air Force Manual (when the NCC arraigned the AF for mentioning Communist infiltration of the clergy) now dying down, the NCC again makes headlines. This time, the controversial clerical organization has put out a controversial manual itself.

The document is a pamphlet, gotten out by the NCC's Department of Racial and Cultural Relations. It is a 40-page reading list of works on "The Negro American" and offers 260 titles of books which it says are "safe to recommend for children."

Washington commentator Fulton Lewis, Jr., has made a study of the works listed in the pamphlet; he points out that 34 of the 202 authors listed have Communist front records, including several notorious party-liners, such as Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, who has charged the US with responsibility for the Korean War, joined over 75 Communist fronts, and in 1953 received a Stalin Peace Prize.

Another recommended author is Langston Hughes, who in 1953 admitted his Communist sympathies and said his earlier pro-Communist works should not be available at US Information Service Libraries in foreign countries. Hughes wrote poems entitled, "One More S in the U. S. A.," written for the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party (the S stands for Soviet), and "Goodbye, Christ," a poem in which Christ is told to "Make way for . . . a real guy named Marx."

Lewis also disclosed that three books the Council recommends as proper reading for children are so obscene a California housewife who spotted them in her local library and wished to draw the attention of civic leaders to the books was warned by her postmaster that they were unmailable.

Cuba: Former Ambassador Spruille Braden last week attacked "the twaddle put out in Washington about time being on our side" and said such talk (obviously the current State Department line) is as unrealistic as the State Department's earlier complacency about the rise of communism in China, following World War II, when that country was lost to the Reds.

Braden was the first (in an interview with HUMAN EVENTS on August 17, 1957) to spot Castro as a Communist leader and to warn of the gravity of things to come in our island neighbor. As a former Ambassador to Cuba (1942-45) and once head of the Inter-American Division of the State Department, he has had exceptional opportunity to appraise our position in the Caribbean. Today, he sounds an alarm:

"We are in such desperate straits in Cuba today that for the foreseeable future there may be no solution short of direct military intervention in order to protect our nation and our neighbors from Communist aggression.

"There is now left to us," says Braden, "only the possibility of giving assistance to or at least refraining from interfering with anti-Castro revolutionary movements . . . . But if we do not do something, and do it soon, we will be faced with such outrages that finally we may be forced into an intervention."

Social Insurance: The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has just finished arguing a case before the US Supreme Court which gives official confirmation of what HUMAN EVENTS has long contended—that the Old Age Survivors Insurance program (Social Security) is definitely *not* an insurance program.

Briefs filed by the Department, in a case where a deported alien is now suing Secretary Flemming for OASI benefits, state the following: "The OASI program is in no sense a Federally-administered 'insurance program' . . . . While the Act uses the term 'insurance' . . . the 'contributions' exacted is a tax." And the Social Security program, it goes on to say, must be viewed as a "welfare instrument."

HUMAN EVENTS *on September 24, 1952 called the program "fiscally a fraud and a swindle—in that our Old Age 'insurance' is not insurance at all, but a double deception whereby the Government levies a Social Security tax insufficient to provide for the benefits which should be paid out, but which meanwhile provides immense sums which the Government uses in ways which have nothing whatever to do with Social Security."*

A. SYDNEY HERLONG, JR., Member of Congress from Florida: "I would like to say that I thoroughly enjoy reading HUMAN EVENTS. Its philosophy is akin to mine, and I find the publication helpful and informative. I wish every American could read it."

ANCHER NELSEN, Member of Congress from Minnesota: "HUMAN EVENTS is always a thought-provoking publication and a valuable contribution to the understanding of the Washington scene."

ADDITIONAL COPIES of this News Section: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000, $25 per thousand. *Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth class mail which takes* ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first class mail delivery, ADD one cent a copy; for airmail, ADD two cents a copy.

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1960.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months $3.

For change of address send old address (EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). ALLOW US TWO WEEKS to process new subscriptions and change of address. Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 14—Article Section I HUMAN EVENTS April 7, 1960

The Need For Nuclear Tests

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Why Bomb-Banning Is More Dangerous Than Radiation

By WILLIAM SCHULZ
(Assistant to Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

FOUR THOUSAND MILES from Washington in Geneva, Switzerland, nuclear scientists of the East and West are meeting in a "little Summit Conference," the results of which could be far more disastrous than any agreements signed by the leaders of the "Big Five" later this spring. As the second anniversary of these tedious negotiations nears, the politicians and scientists of the free world and the Soviet Union plod on towards a nuclear test ban and a program of world disarmament.

However laudable these objectives may seem, the Geneva conferences might well mean for the United States an agreement that is militarily suicidal and politically indefensible, one that hands to the Russians the balance of power and the key to world domination.

The Communists' first objective, of course, has been accomplished, without an agreement of any kind. The Soviet Union, brandishing the seemingly awesome club of "world opinion," has blackmailed the US into dropping its entire program of nuclear weapons testing and development. With a bow in the direction of Messrs. Khrushchev and Nehru, the President of the United States has publicly branded the development of new nuclear weapons as dangerous to all mankind.

To weigh the gravity of this diplomatic defeat, it is necessary to examine the true facts about nuclear testing in the light of present scientific knowledge. The Communist propagandists on both sides of the Iron Curtain have made it appear as though atomic radiation is a new and unnatural phenomenon. Nothing could be further from the truth. Radioactivity is a pervasive feature of man's environment. Human beings are exposed to an unending spray of radiation from cosmic rays and natural radioactive substances: radium, uranium, potassium 40, carbon 14, etc. Fallout radiation is no different in biological effect from this natural radiation —and is very much smaller in quantity.

Scientific reports from all quarters and all nations show that the total amount of radioactivity caused by 14 years of nuclear testing is equal to about two per cent of that caused by background and man-made (chiefly medical x-rays) radiation. A special United Nations committee of scientists from 15 nations studied the matter for two years and concluded that if weapons tests continued for the next 100 years, the average man would still be getting only four per cent as much radiation from this source as he gets from natural sources. Bomb tests, the committee concluded, have less chance of affecting the human species than either natural or man-made radiation, including that from television sets!

Present fallout levels are but a small percentage of the "permissible safe levels" of fallout radiation set by impartial experts, including the National Academy of Sciences. The Atomic Energy Commission has released reports showing that the present level of strontium 90 (the most feared of all fallout isotopes) in the bones of people of all ages in 13 nations and five continents, is about one ten-thousandth of the permissible dose.

Another, more recent, report on strontium 90 by a team of British scientists discloses that the ordinary British diet contains amounts of thorium and radium equivalent in their effect to about 300 times the present intake of strontium 90 from nuclear explosions. Reported the British investigators after two years study: "If the present level of strontium 90 in food in this country represents a radiation hazard . . . then the whole process of eating food must be regarded as highly dangerous."

As for the charges that nuclear tests are responsible for the agonizing deaths of millions of leukemia victims and hundreds of thousands of harmful mutations in future generations, these too are not borne out by careful study. The American Cancer Society, after extensive research in the field, reports there is no proof that bomb test fallout is connected in any way with leukemia. In fact, declares the Society, although cases of blood cancer have been climbing in the past 30 years, "the rate of increase has been falling off slightly during the past 15 years—since the first bombs were exploded."

Although genetics is by no means his specialty, Dr. Linus Pauling (who has, incidentally, scores of Communist front affiliations to his credit) has written that each nuclear bomb exploded means that "fifteen thousand seriously defective children will be born in later generations." Dr. Stafford Warren, Dean of the UCLA Medical School, however, reports there is no conclusive evidence that radiation from fallout has had any genetic effect on humans.

Speaking of the many research projects involving survivors of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings, Dr. Warren says, "There have been no obvious genetic effects that could be assigned to radiation as a result of the atomic bomb drops of World War II."

Dr. Warren goes on to describe tests fellow scientists have run on fish and animals, including some on salmon running through 10 generations. The scientists "have found little or no lasting effect. Some of the fish produced in the latter generations were of an interesting variety of colors, but whether this was because of the radiation we do not know."

In summing up the medical dangers from nuclear bomb tests, 160 scientists from nine Western nations—the Soviet Union refused to send any delegates—met under the auspices of the Swiss Academy of Medical Sciences less than two years ago and declared:

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The present increase in atmospheric radioactivity and in radioactive precipitation plays no essential part and has no practical importance compared with natural radiation. The values which have been recorded do not, in any case, constitute a danger to the health of mankind."

ON OCTOBER 4, 1957, President Eisenhower penned a lengthy letter to Prime Minister Kishi of Japan, who had pleaded for a cessation of nuclear tests. Firmly, the President informed Kishi the US would continue with its nuclear testing. "In the present circumstances the security of the United States, and, I believe, that of the free world, depends to a great degree upon what we learn from the testing of nuclear weapons. We are at a stage when testing is required for the development of important defensive uses of nuclear weapons, particularly against missiles, submarines, and air craft as well as to reduce further the fallout yield from nuclear weapons."

As late as December of 1957, Eisenhower wrote Prime Minister Nehru that, "To stop these tests at this time . . . is a sacrifice which we could not in prudence accept."

Yet eight months later, on August 22, 1958, the President instituted a year-long moratorium on US nuclear testing, a ban that continues to this day. The exact reasons for this about-face are unknown. But one thing is certain: The President is proceeding against the advice of his top military advisors. General Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has testified the tests are "very definitely necessary" for military development.

Naval and Army leaders agree with the Air Force General, for nuclear arms are adaptable for every conceivable type of military operation. The AEC, for instance, is currently developing a radically new series of small tactical atomic weapons at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Berkeley, California. Code-named for birds such as "dove" and "starling," the warheads will be assigned to the Army for limited-war use. Their fallout is negligible. Like the atomic bazooka now under development, these weapons can be easily handled by regular field forces. Although extremely promising on the drawing board and in the laboratories, there will be no production of these weapons before they are first tested. When that will be is pure conjecture.

There are scores of other new weapons whose production is held up by the Eisenhower test ban. Development of smaller, fallout-free warheads for the Polaris missile and longer-range ICBMs is stymied. An effective defense against enemy missiles is made almost impossible without a testing period.

A permanent US ban on nuclear weapons plays into Communist hands because the free world has based its entire defense—including its deterrent theory of massive retaliation—on nuclear weapons. Comments "liberal" military strategist Henry Kissinger: "Nowhere in the Western world are there sufficient conventional forces to resist the Soviet preponderance in conventional strength . . . . Nothing now stands in the way of Soviet domination save the Soviet reluctance to pay the price of a nuclear war."

A nuclear test ban, however "foolproof" its proponents may claim, is all the more frightening because in all probability the Reds can easily evade any such scheme. Air Force Chief of Staff General Thomas White declares flatly, "I question whether the Russians would even discuss this thing if they weren't sure they could cheat."

Evidence continues to mount that White is correct. The President's Berkner Commission, named after the group's chairman Dr. Lloyd Berkner, determined last year that cheating under a nuclear ban is "easy." It is virtually impossible, the report concluded, to distinguish many underground atomic explosions from earthquakes. The Berkner study was followed a few months later by an even more pessimistic report, drawn up by crack nuclear physicist Kenneth Watson.

This report explains in detail how the Reds could "muffle" nuclear explosions in large underground caves behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, reducing the detectable shock waves that follow such explosions by as much as 99.67 per cent. A bomb five times greater than the one that leveled Hiroshima would register on nearby seismographs as a few sticks of TNT. Larger bombs would resemble small earthquakes—of which there are thousands each year.

Secretary of State Herter admits that an adequate inspection and detection system is an impossibility. He hopes an admittedly "inadequate" system will deter the Reds from cheating.

In the face of overwhelming evidence, a frightened Government is driving toward a nuclear test ban from which there is no return. Future historians may well record a nation, at once the most powerful and the most gullible in the world, that committed neuclear suicide in the cause of "peace." It was a nation that refused to heed even the words of J. Robert Oppenheimer on an occasion when he spoke the truth:

"With the enormous and unpredictable rapidity with which new things come up, we cannot possible devise an agreement on disarmament that will be good 20 to 30 years from now unless we banish inquiry and discovery."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. $11 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE NEED FOR NUCLEAR TESTS" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies, $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 14—Article Section II HUMAN EVENTS April 7, 1960

Khrushchev Had the Right Word

Is Our System 'Capitalism' --- or 'Democracy?'

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By FRANK CHODOROV

WHEN NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV said that the ideological world conflict is between communism and capitalism, and that in the end communism would win out, there should have been no misunderstanding of his meaning. He was simply following the Marxist line of dialectical materialism, with which those who have pretensions of intellectualism ought to be familiar.

He was saying that just as capitalism replaced feudalism because of its superior productive capacity, so will communism supersede capitalism and for the same reason. He was talking economics, not politics; he was declaring that an economy based on the free market cannot produce as much in goods and services as one that is controlled, regulated and planned by Government.

Production "for profit," according to his book, results in the output of useless things, things people ought not to have, besides causing an inequitable distribution of wealth, while competition results in waste and inefficiency. Communism, in which production "for use" is the guiding principle, will in due time demonstrate its superiority and capitalism will fall by the wayside.

That's exactly what he meant. There should have been no doubt about it. Yet, some Americans of the "liberal" persuasion, while admitting the existence of world conflict in ideas, insist that the difference is political rather than economic in character. So Nelson Rockefeller declares that "the choice is between democracy and communism, not between communism and capitalism." Eleanor Roosevelt seconds the motion. And Rockefeller's predecessor in Albany, Averell Harriman, stresses the point by saying: "It seems to me that we should not permit Khrushchev or any other Communist to write us down as the standard bearer of capitalism . . . . We should make it clear that the struggle is not between communism and capitalism, it is between democracy and dictatorship." Then, to emphasize his prejudice, Harriman declares that "we should abolish the word capitalism."

Now, that sounds like a battle of words, an exercise in semantics, until we go behind the verbiage in search of ideas. And then we find that in point of fact that Khrushchev and these "liberal" critics are not so far apart as they seem to be.

In the quotation cited above, Harriman intimates that in his opinion Khrushchev insults us by making us the "standard bearer of capitalism." He shares the Communist's poor opinion of capitalism by suggesting that the very word ought to be expunged from the dictionary. Since Messrs. Harriman and Rockefeller (to say nothing of Mrs. Roosevelt) are admittedly exponents of what is called "liberalism," the philosophy of the eggheads, their disavowal of capitalism takes on meaning. If the "liberals" get control of the machinery of government in this country, will they take steps to abolish the system as well as the word? And will they substitute for it something akin to communism?

Khrushchev used the right word, despite the efforts of the "liberals" to confuse the issue. To him, capitalism means private property, or, as he would put it, the ownership by individuals of the means of production and distribution. His definition of communism, economically speaking, is the ownership by the State of all the means of production and distribution—that is, of all capital. He would admit the abolition of private property calls for the offices of a strong State, a dictatorship, simply because—as he would explain it—men have long been conditioned by capitalists, in their own interest, to an acceptance of the idea of private property. When this idea shall have been ripped out of their consciousness, when they shall have been reconditioned, there will be no need of a strong State and the dictatorship will wither away. The State is a means, not an end. The end is a general abundance and an equitable distribution of the things men live by.

THE ROCKEFELLER-HARRIMAN-ROOSEVELT school of thought would shift the emphasis from economics to politics. To them the conflict of ideas is not between one way of securing a living and another, but between one system of government and another. They abhor communism because it is a dictatorship, and they extol democracy because—well, here we are stuck because of the vagueness which "liberal" usage has given the word.

Etymologically, democracy describes a political system in which all the people vote on every public issue. That kind of government we have never had, outside the New England town hall meeting, and is indeed impossible in a political unit larger than a village. Ours is a republican form of government, one that derives its authority for a stipulated period by popular suffrage; it is democratic only in the sense that the privilege of voting is widespread.

In "liberal" usage, however, the word democracy describes what they call an "attitude of mind," and the only attitude of mind that can be designated democratic is one that conforms to the going "liberal" platform. This is a bit ambiguous, but perhaps our understanding will be improved if we refer to a statement made by Harriman at a public forum. He said that in this country "the revolution of the 1930's brought fundamental changes in our government's responsibility for economic stability and social welfare."

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The "revolution" was, of course, the New Deal, and since all good "liberals" look upon that era as ushering in the kind of democracy they favor, we can take it for granted that they use the word to describe government which assumes responsibility for "economic stability and social welfare."

That is to say, they are all for government intervention in the economy. That is not capitalism. Capitalism assumes, *a priori,* that government has no competence whatsoever in economic matters; its only competence is in the field of coercion, of which it enjoys a monopoly, and coercion is simply unable to produce any wealth. Production, says capitalism, is the application of human effort to raw materials so as to yield something that people want. When the individual is permitted to keep and dispose of the fruits of his labor as he sees fit, he is encouraged to produce more. Abundance is the natural consequence of possession.

On the other hand, when the government undertakes to intervene in the economy it brings its power of coercion into play, since that is the only tool in its kit. The coercion is always used, as Voltaire put it, to take money from one set of pockets to put into another; there is nothing else Government can do. The result of such appropriation of wealth is to discourage production. Why work when you cannot enjoy the proceeds of your labors? Thus, the tendency, when government intervenes in the economy, is to cause shortages rather than abundance.

Can the government do anything to encourage production? Yes, says capitalism, by seeing to it that the producer is not deprived of his property. It has a negative function only. In fact, the only reason for the existence of government is to protect life and property.

Until the "revolution of the 1930's," the twin essentials of capitalism—private property and limited government —were characteristic of Americanism. In most other countries capitalism was merely tolerated; the governments never gave up their prerogative of interfering in the economies of their nations. But, in America, during its first one hundred and forty years, the right to own property was woven into the mores of the people, was written into the Constitution and was sanctified by the Declaration of Independence. So much so that even after the "revolution of the 1930's" the best the "liberals" can do is to suggest that human rights take precedence over property rights—their sly way of deprecating capitalism. However, under capitalism, this country, starting with less than the "underdeveloped" countries of the world now have, built an economy which is the envy of the world. Capitalism has proven itself.

The Rockefeller-Harriman-Roosevelt school does not propose to abolish capitalism, it would merely abolish the word and substitute the word democracy for it. Why? Because they favor government "responsibility for economic stability and social welfare." That is, they prefer positive government, one which assumes an active role in the economy. Since the government is not and cannot be a producer of things, the only function it can perform is that of shifting possession or property from producers to non-producers. That is to say, it can only violate the right of private property.

That is, the "liberals," who deprecate capitalism and espouse democracy, are on the same ideological train Khrushchev has boarded. They do not go all the way with him, but they are headed in the same direction.

THE ISSUE, AS KHRUSHCHEV put it, is between capitalism and communism. When he says that communism will win over capitalism, he refers to the relative productive capacities of the two systems. He is talking of free choice in the market, not in the ballot booth. If, he insists, the individual is not permitted to indulge his whims, if he is deprived of his property so that he cannot cater to his unregulated appetite, the bureaucracy will see to it that he has more of everything that he really needs. The inefficiency of capitalism, which communism will shortly show up, is due exactly to insistence on the right of the individual to pursue happiness in his own way, without let or hindrance. The issue is clear in his mind.

Our "liberals" do not see the issue quite as clearly, simply because they are impaled on their prejudices. To them, as to Khrushchev, capitalism is a bad word. They accept, quite unconsciously, the evil connotation gratuitously attached to it by Karl Marx. Over a century ago he said that capitalism is characterized by exploitation; the owner of capital pays his workers a subsistence wage and confiscates all they produce above that level. Despite the fact that that fanciful theory has been completely demolished, in theory and in practice, the immoral connotation has stuck, and our incorrigible "liberals" seem incapable of getting rid of it. Besides, since they are persuaded that a managed economy is preferable to a free one, they are averse to meeting Khrushchev on his own terms. So, they offer democracy as the opposition to communism.

In the final analysis, democracy is the last refuge of the "liberal."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "KHRUSHCHEV HAD THE RIGHT WORD" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies, $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED